DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 288 TM 003 251

AUTHOR	Johnson, Lary
TITLE	Reorganized Junior High Program: An Evaluation 1971-72. A Title III, ESEA Project.
INSTITUTION	Minneapolis Public Schools, Minn. Dept. of Research and Evaluation
REPORT NO	C-71-13
PUB DATE	Sep 72
NOTE	73p.; DIR-1
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Counseling Effectiveness; *Counselor Role; Evaluation Techniques; Intermediate Grades; Junior High Schools; *Program Evaluation; *Student Attitudes; Student Evaluation; Student School Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes; Technical Reports
IDENTIFIERS	*Minneapolis Public Schools

ABSTRACT

The evaluation of the first year of the ESEA Title III Reorganized Junior High Program at Jordan and Marshall University Junior High Schools is reported. The product objectives of the program were: (1) increased counselor effectiveness, (2) positive student attitude towards teachers, counselors, and school, and (3) increased parent and student involvement in school. Activities, or process objectives, for the attainment of the product objectives were: workshops, classroom visits, coordination of support services, meeting between counselors and teachers, and information dissemination regarding activities. The counselors and the program were evaluated by the teachers, and student perceptions of the counselor, student attitudes toward school and teachers, and parent and student involvement were obtained. Results of the study showed that teacher opinions of counselor effectiveness were much better than they were the previous year; students at Jordan had somewhat less favorable attitudes toward their counselors and the counseling relationship than did students the previous year; at Marshall University school, more teacher-counselor contacts and more favorable ratings of counselor effectiveness were reported by team teachers than by non-team teachers or by teachers the previous year; team students had more positive attitudes toward school and had more input into class decisions. An appendix provides new student evaluation forms. (For related document, see TM 003 252.) (DB)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 083288

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Research and Evaluation

TM 003 251
TM 003 252

Educational Services

Minneapolis Public Schools

BOARD OF EDUCATION

Richard F. Allen, Chairman

Frank E. Adams	W. Harry Davis	Mrs. Marilyn A. Borea
Philip A. Olson	David W. Preuss	Stuart W. Rider, Jr.

SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS

John B. Davis, Jr.

MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Special School District No. 1
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413

An Equal Opportunity Employer

ED 083288

TM 003 251

Minneapolis Public Schools

Reorganized Junior High Program: An Evaluation 1971-72

A Title III, ESEA Project

Lary Johnson

Ideas expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Minneapolis Public School Administration nor the Minneapolis School Board.

September 1972
C-71-13 Order No.

Research and Evaluation Department
Educational Services Division
807 N. E. Broadway
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413

Minneapolis Public Schools

Reorganized Junior High Program: An Evaluation 1971-72

Summary

See page

This evaluation report covers the first year of the ESEA Title III Reorganized Junior High Program that operated at Jordan and Marshall-University Junior High Schools. The underlying goal of the project was to develop a positive, student-centered program that would facilitate development of all students. A major procedure to attain this goal was to change the role of the counselor from that of a traditional resource person to more of a team member and facilitator. More specifically, the product objectives were: (1) increased counselor effectiveness, (2) positive student attitude towards teachers, counselors, and school, and (3) increased parent and student involvement in school. 1,2

The two seventh grade counselors at Jordan concentrated on increased contacts with seventh grade teachers through workshops, classroom visits, and daily meetings in the seventh grade office. The counselors also assumed responsibility for the usual administrative role in the area of student behavior. Teacher opinions of counselor effectiveness were much better in 1971-72 than in 1970-71. Fifty-five percent of the teachers said counselors were very helpful in 1971-72, compared with 12% in 1970-71. 4-7 8-12

Changes occurred in the type of student-counselor contacts at Jordan and students' perception of the counselor's job which reflected the changed role of the counselor in the student behavior area. Students in the project year had somewhat less favorable attitudes toward their counselor and the counseling relationship than did students in the previous year. 16-24

At Marshall-University two teacher-counselor teams were set up for half of the students in grades seven and eight. At each grade level the team consisted of a counselor and four teachers, one each from English, mathematics, science, and social studies. Daily team meetings during the team teachers' common preparation time were the core of the project. The team teachers said they would like to operate as a team again in the following year and that the counselor was a useful and necessary member of the team. More teacher-counselor contacts and more favorable ratings of counselor effectiveness were reported by team teachers than by either non-team teachers or teachers from the previous year. 31-41

The team students, as compared with non-team students, had more positive attitudes toward school and indicated they had more input into class decisions. 48-54

Recommendations were made to continue counselor efforts to work with teachers, to devote more time to curriculum and instruction development, to look more closely at counselor-student relationships, and to provide for greater parent and student input into the program. 29,56

September 1972

Research and Evaluation Department

Table of Contents

	Page
Objectives	1
Budget	3
Jordan Component	3
Evaluation of Process Objectives	4
Evaluation of Product Objectives	7
Teacher Evaluation of the Counselors	8
Teacher Evaluation of the Program	12
Student Perceptions of the Counselor	16
Student Attitudes Toward School and Teachers	25
Parent and Student Involvement	27
Jordan Summary and Recommendations	29
Marshall-University Component	31
Evaluation of Process Objectives	32
Evaluation of Product Objectives	35
Teacher Evaluation of Counselor Effectiveness	35
Team Teacher Reactions to the Project	41
Student Perceptions of the counselor	42
Team Student Reactions to the Program	47
Student Attitudes Toward School and Teachers	48
Student and Parent Involvement	53
Marshall-University Summary and Recommendations	56
Appendix A: New Student Evaluation Forms	58

List of Tables

Table No.		Page
1	Frequency that Seventh Grade Teachers Used the Seventh Grade Office	7
2	Frequency That Counselors Worked with Jordan Teachers in Several Areas as Reported by the Teachers	9
3	1970-71 and 1971-72 Opinions of Jordan Teachers as to Whether Counselors and Teachers Should Work Together in Several Areas	10
4	Helpfulness of Counselors in Several Areas as Reported by Jordan Teachers Who Worked With the Counselor at Least Once in that Area	11
5	Jordan Teachers' Rating of Overall Counselor Helpfulness	12
6	Jordan Teachers' Comparison of the 1970-71 and 1971-72 Seventh Grade Programs	13
7	Amount of Contact Jordan Junior High Seventh Grade Students Had With Their Counselor in 1970-71 and 1971-72	17
8	Percentage of Student-Counselor Talks in Various Areas for Students Who Talked With Their Counselor at Jordan Junior High in 1970-71 and 1971-72	19
9	Percentage of Students in Grade Seven Who Talked With Their Counselor Because They Broke School Rules at Jordan Junior High: 1970-71 and 1971-72	20
10	Seventh Grade Students' Description of Student-Counselor Talks About Breaking School Rules at Jordan Junior High: 1970-71 and 1971-72	20
11	Seventh Grade Students' Perceptions of the Counselor's Job at Jordan Junior High: 1970-71 and 1971-72	21
12	Seventh Grade Students' Perceptions of the Counselor at Jordan Junior High: 1970-71 and 1971-72	23
13	Overall Rating of Counselor Helpfulness by Jordan Seventh Grade Students in 1970-71 and 1971-72	25

List of Tables (continued)

Table No.		Page
14	Jordan Seventh Graders' Attitudes Toward School in 1970-71 and 1971-72.	26
15	Jordan Seventh Graders' Attitudes Toward Their Teachers in 1970-71 and 1971-72.	28
16	Jordan Seventh Graders' Opinions About Their Input in the School Program in 1970-71 and 1971-72.	29
17	Frequency That Counselors Worked with Marshall-University Teachers in Several Areas as Reported by the Teachers	37
18	1970-71 and 1971-72 Opinions of Marshall-University Teachers as to Whether Counselors and Teachers Should Work Together in Several Areas.	38
19	Helpfulness of Counselors in Several Areas as Reported by Marshall-University Teachers Who Worked with the Counselor at Least Once in That Area.	39
20	Marshall-University Seventh and Eighth Grade Teacher Ratings of Overall Counselor Helpfulness . . .	40
21	Amount of Contact Marshall-University Seventh and Eighth Grade Students Had With Their Counselor in 1970-71 and 1971-72	43
22	Marshall-University Seventh and Eighth Grade Students' Perceptions of Their Counselor in 1970-71 and 1971-72.	45
23	Overall Rating of Counselor Helpfulness by Marshall-University Seventh and Eighth Grade Students in 1970-71 and 1971-72.	47
24	Team Students' Opinions of the Team Organization . . .	47
25	Reactions of Eighth Grade Team Students to the Mini-units	49
26	Marshall-University Seventh and Eighth Graders' Attitudes Toward School in 1970-71 and 1971-72.	50

List of Tables (continued)

Table No.		Page
27	Marshall-University Seventh and Eighth Graders' Attitudes Toward Their Teachers in 1970-71 and 1971-72	52
28	Marshall-University Seventh and Eighth Graders' Opinions About Their Input Into School Program in 1970-71 and 1971-72.	54
29	Awareness of Marshall-University Parents of Team Students of the Team Organization.	55
30	Amount of Contact Marshall-University Parents of Team Students had With Members of the Team.	55

Minneapolis Public Schools

Reorganized Junior High Program: An Evaluation 1971-72

The rationale for the ESEA Title III Reorganized Junior High School Program, as indicated in the project proposal, came from a conviction that the diffused efforts and the lack of unified procedures at the junior high level precluded an environment in which all students could reach their fullest potential. There was a need to develop a positive, student-centered program that would facilitate development of all students. With this need in mind, the Reorganized Junior High School Program set the following general goals: (1) the improvement of the teaching-learning capacity of the junior high school, (2) the utilization of the expertise of all school personnel to their fullest potential, and (3) the improvement of the quality of urban education by focusing attention on the needs of the students.

A major characteristic of the project was that it called for the counselor to change his role from that of a traditional resource person to more of a team member and facilitator. It was assumed that the counselor's professional training and skills would allow him to take an active role in creating a positive, student-centered program. ESEA Title III funds were used to hire an additional counselor for each of the two schools in the project, Jordan and Marshall-University Junior High Schools. With the exception of the next section on objectives and the subsequent section on the budget, the Jordan and Marshall-University components will be reported separately.

The project administrator for the Reorganized Junior High School Program was Dr. Ralph H. Johnson, Director of Guidance Services of the Minneapolis Public Schools. The evaluation of the project was conducted by the Minneapolis Public Schools' Research and Evaluation Department as a local commitment to the project.

Objectives

Some changes were made in the objectives as stated in the original proposal to make them more meaningful to the staff members at both schools. As will be seen in the later sections, the Marshall-University component placed more emphasis on the counselor as a team member than as a coordinator or implementor. The following objectives were accepted by the staff members in both schools.

Objective One

During the project year, the counselor will show a measurable increase in effectiveness as a counselor, team member, program coordinator, and facilitator.

(1) In workshops to be set up in the fall of the project year, the counselors will coordinate program planning with staff, students, and parents at his grade level to develop staff teams, curriculum and house policies.

(2) During the project year, the counselor will plan and lead two half-day workshops to evaluate the program and institute changes that seem necessary. Evaluation will involve examining the goals established in the fall workshops and measuring the degree to which those goals are being met.

(3) During the project year, the counselor will visit each classroom at least once each week to observe students and to monitor progress toward program objectives, and will record these visits on an attendance tally sheet.

(4) During the project year, the counselor will coordinate student support services as the requests are made by teachers, students, or parents.

(5) During the project year, the counselor will meet with the teacher teams to implement the program objectives defined in the workshop and will record progress in a log.

(6) During the project year, the counselor will disseminate information about the program and other school activities through a regularly published grade level newsletter handed out to teachers, students and parents.

(7) During the project year, the counselor will help to develop a positive atmosphere for a team approach to students during the daily common preparation period by serving as a resource person for the grade level team at these meetings.

Objective Two

At the end of the project year, the students involved in the program will respond positively to the counselors, teachers, and school.

Objective Three

Students and parents will show increased interest and involvement in the total school program.

Budget

Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 provided $41,000 for the Reorganized Junior High Program for the 1971-72 school year.

Item	Budgeted Amount
Two counselors salaries	$27,455
Staff development	7,254
Consultation services	1,500
Materials	500
Dissemination	1,000
Audit	820
Fringe benefits on salaries	2,471
	$41,000

The Minneapolis Public Schools provided the following funds as a local commitment to the project.

Item	Budgeted Amount
Remodeling	$2,000
Director's Salary (3%)	800
Clerical salary .5 time	2,226
Aide	2,189
Evaluation	1,640
Equipment (new)	500
	$9,355

Jordan Component

Two experienced counselors, each working with one half of the 370 seventh grade students, were involved with the project at Jordan Junior High. Jordan has a minority group population of about 6 percent, with an annual student turnover greater than 20 percent. On the basis of economic factors, Jordan qualified as a Title I school for the 1971-72 school year. Many of the students have academic difficulties and during the past year special services were provided by the Basic Skills Center, special education, and remedial reading classes.

After it was determined that the Reorganized Junior High Program would be funded, an organizational change was made at Jordan that not only helped, but actually forced, the two seventh grade counselors to change their role. A seventh grade house was established by changing a classroom on the third

floor to a seventh grade area that included two offices for the counselors, an office for a social worker aide, a reception area, and a conference-meeting area. An assistant principal no longer was assigned to the seventh grade. Although administrators were available as resource people when the counselors felt they were necessary, the seventh grade counselors assumed responsibility for the usual administrative role in the area of student behavior. In other words, all seventh grade concerns were funneled into the seventh grade office and the two seventh grade counselors.

Evaluation of Process Objectives

In the proposal a number of activities or process objectives were listed whose fulfillment would hopefully lead to attainment of the major outcomes or product objectives. As noted on page 2, these process objectives were related to objective one, the changed role of the counselor. Were the activities carried out?

Process Objectives 1 and 2: Workshops

Six workshops, coordinated by the counselors, were held during the school year. About one-half of the teachers with at least one seventh grade class attended each workshop. They were usually held on non-school days and the participants were paid by Title III funds.

The initial two half-day workshops in August were attended by 23 teachers. Since the Jordan staff had not participated in writing the proposal, these two half-days were spent discussing the project's objectives, counselor responsibilities, teacher responsibilities, and general objectives for the coming school year.

At an early October workshop, goals were reviewed and committees were established to work on four major areas of concern.

1. Development of a new grading system for the seventh grade.
2. Development of more opportunities for seventh graders to establish their own identity.
3. Development of teacher-counselor teams to work on curriculum process.
4. Development of a clearer method of referring students to the seventh grade office.

Further discussion of the new grading system to be used during the second semester and of the student referral system occurred at a December workshop.

In addition, a list of concerns regarding the 1972-73 seventh grade program were drawn up and presented to all seventh grade staff members for their reaction. The thirteen concerns were ranked in the following order of importance.

1. A committee of seventh grade teachers to work with the administration on possible program variations
2. Teachers would teach exclusively at one grade level
3. Adjust the length of classes to better meet the needs of the subject and the student
4. A time when the seventh grade staff as a whole or as teams can get together
5. A pocket school
6. An opportunity to group students at various levels of development
7. A program that will allow students some choices
8. Investigate various ways of reducing class size
9. Teachers teach in subjects of their choice
10. An integrated curriculum. Teams within and between subject areas
11. An assistant principal as well as two counselors
12. Elimination of homeroom period
13. Free time during the day for students

An evaluation workshop held in January was attended by only 10 staff members. Although the staff members who attended appeared to be sincerely interested in developing a better seventh grade program, it also appeared that they felt there had not been enough time to establish many goals or to make many changes. In addition the project was hindered by the facts that only part of the seventh grade staff was participating in the workshops and common meeting times were not available to all teachers.

At an April workshop, parent, student, and teacher reactions to the new report card system were discussed. Teachers and parents were in favor of the new system 2:1, while students were fairly evenly split between the old and new systems. A copy of the new "Achievement Report", as it is called, is in Appendix A. Traditional letter grades were discarded. Each teacher established learning objectives for each student and then graded each student's progress on each objective as achieved, partially achieved, or little progress. The new evaluation system included a behavior evaluation scale and space for teacher comments.

At the last workshop in May, the seventh grade staff came up with the following topics to be discussed at next fall's workshop.

1. Rules and procedures to be followed in seventh grade
2. How to write objectives
3. How to use the Achievement Report
4. Time to meet with team members
5. Introduction of new teaching techniques

Process Objective 3: Classroom Visits

An accurate weekly log of counselor visits to individual classrooms was kept throughout the school year by the counselors. Between the two counselors they visited an average of 67 classrooms each week.

On a questionnaire administered in May 1972, 96% of the responding seventh grade teachers reported that a counselor observed their classroom five or more times during the 1971-72 school year (Table 2 on page 9). In a similar questionnaire administered in September 1971, only 8% of the teachers said a counselor observed their classroom five or more times during the year (1970-71) before the project.

Also, 62% of the teachers in 1971-72, compared with 24% of the teachers in 1970-71, said that counselors actively participated in classroom activities.

Process Objective 4: Coordinate Support Services

The counselors were responsible for support services by the nature of the seventh grade organization.

Process Objective 5 and 7: Meet with Teacher Teams

The school's master teaching schedule made it difficult for the counselors to meet with teacher teams. Forty-two teachers taught at least one seventh grade class. Eleven of these teachers had only one seventh grade class and twenty others taught all three grade levels in areas such as physical education, music, home economics, industrial arts, and special education.

Many English, social studies, and math teachers did have common preparation periods with other teachers in their subject area. Some of these prep periods were used to meet with counselors and other teachers in the conference room in the seventh grade office, which served as an informal gathering place for seventh grade teachers during the day. The master schedule did not provide

common prep time for interdisciplinary team planning or for team planning by teachers with the same students.

However, the counselors did meet with many of the teachers during the day in the seventh grade office. Of the 30 teachers who responded to the questionnaire given at the end of the year, 18 teachers (60%) said they visited or made use of the seventh grade office three or more times a week (Table 1).

Table 1

Frequency that Seventh Grade Teachers Used the Seventh Grade Office

	N	%
Every day	7	23%
3-4 times a week	11	37
Once or twice a week	6	20
Once or twice a month	3	10
Once or twice during year	3	10
Never	0	0

It can probably be assumed that the 12 teachers who did not respond to the questionnaire were those who were not very involved with any aspect of the project.

Process Objective 6: Dissemination

Throughout the year the seventh grade office printed a bi-weekly bulletin called Dimension-7. The first nine issues were directed to staff members only. Starting with the tenth issue, in February, Dimension-7 was distributed to seventh grade students and parents as well as staff.

Evaluation of Product Objectives

The product objectives were identified in the proposal as (1) increased counselor effectiveness, (2) positive student response to teachers, counselors, and school, and (3) increased parent and student involvement in school.

The following sections discuss the attainment of these objectives.

Teacher Evaluation of the Counselors

To be viewed as more effective counselors by the teachers, it was assumed that counselors would have to work more closely with teachers. As indicated by the review of process objective attainment, some evidence of increased counselor-teacher contacts exists.

To obtain a more accurate estimate of counselor-teacher working relationships, seventh grade teachers were asked in September 1971 to estimate the number of contacts they had with counselors during the previous 1970-71 school year. In May 1972 the teachers were asked to make similar estimates for the 1971-72 school year. Comparisons between the two years were made more meaningful by the facts that the same teachers made both estimates and that the two seventh grade counselors in 1971-72 were two of the three counselors who worked with seventh grade teachers in 1970-71.

Results of these estimates are presented in Table 2 on page 9. The responding teachers represented about two-thirds of the teachers who had at least one seventh grade class. Teachers reported that the frequency of counselor-teacher contacts in 1971-72 was greater than in 1970-71 for all areas listed except "cooperatively planning curriculum." The majority of teachers had five or more contacts with a counselor in 1971-72 in the following areas: provided information about individual students, provided a referral resource for students who needed special help, offered suggestions that helped me cope with students who were not adjusting to class, observed the classroom, participated in conferences concerning students with problems. Although contacts were not frequent, 54% of the teachers also said the counselors suggested activities and methods to develop an appropriate classroom atmosphere.

Teachers were asked whether or not counselors and teachers should work together in each of the areas (Table 3 on page 10). Teachers unanimously agreed on the counselor's role in the more traditional areas 1, 2, 3, and 6. A decided majority of the teachers also said counselors should participate in classroom activities (88%), help develop an appropriate classroom atmosphere (76%), and help plan curriculum (70%). Percentages in some areas were somewhat greater in 1971-72 than in 1970-71.

Most teachers who worked with the counselors in the eight previously mentioned areas indicated that the counselor was helpful in each area (Table 4 on page 11). Counselors were seen as most helpful in the more traditional

Table 2

Frequency That Counselors Worked with Jordan Teachers in Several Areas as Reported by the Teachers (1970-71, N=27; 1971-72, N=29)[a]

Area The Counselor:	Year	More Than Ten Times		5-10 Times		Once or Twice		Never	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Provided information about individual students	1970-71	7	26	12	44	7	26	1	4
	1971-72	18	62	10	34	1	4	0	0
2. Provided a resource for referral of students who needed special help	1970-71	2	7	4	15	18	67	3	11
	1971-72	6	21	9	32	8	29	5	18
3. Offered suggestions that helped me cope with students who were not adjusting to class	1970-71	0	0	11	41	13	48	3	11
	1971-72	6	21	12	41	10	34	1	3
4. Observed the classroom	1970-71	0	0	2	8	8	32	15	60
	1971-72	16	55	12	41	1	3	0	0
5. Actively participated in classroom activities and group discussions	1970-71	0	0	0	0	6	24	19	76
	1971-72	0	0	4	14	14	48	11	38
6. Participated with teachers in conferences concerning students with problems	1970-71	2	8	11	42	12	46	1	4
	1971-72	7	24	14	48	7	24	1	3
7. Suggested or cooperatively planned activities and methods to develop appropriate classroom atmosphere	1970-71	0	0	0	0	5	23	17	77
	1971-72	0	0	3	11	12	43	13	46
8. Suggested or cooperatively planned curriculum to meet the needs of students	1970-71	1	4	3	13	3	13	17	71
	1971-72	0	0	2	7	8	28	19	66

[a]Some teachers did not respond to all areas; therefore, Ns will not always equal 27 and 29.

Table 3

1970-71 and 1971-72 Opinions of Jordan Teachers as to Whether Counselors and Teachers Should Work Together in Several Areas (1970-71, N=27; 1971-72, N=29)

	Area The Counselor:	Year	Yes		No		No Answer
			N	%	N	%	N
1.	Provided information about individual students	1970-71	26	100	0	0	1
		1971-72	29	100	0	0	0
2.	Provided a resource for referral of students who needed special help	1970-71	26	96	1	4	0
		1971-72	27	100	0	0	2
3.	Offered suggestions that helped me cope with students who were not adjusting to class	1970-71	23	92	2	8	2
		1971-72	29	100	0	0	0
4.	Observed the classroom	1970-71	16	73	6	27	5
		1971-72	27	93	2	7	0
5.	Actively participated in classroom activities and group discussions	1970-71	15	71	6	29	6
		1971-72	23	88	3	12	3
6.	Participated with teachers in conferences concerning students with problems	1970-71	27	100	0	0	0
		1971-72	29	100	0	0	0
7.	Suggested or cooperatively planned activities and methods to develop appropriate classroom atmosphere	1970-71	15	68	7	32	5
		1971-72	16	76	5	24	8
8.	Suggested or cooperatively planned curriculum to meet the needs of students	1970-71	18	75	6	25	3
		1971-72	16	70	7	30	6

Table 4

Helpfulness of Counselors in Several Areas as Reported by Jordan Teachers Who Worked With the Counselor at Least Once in That Area (1970-71, N=27; 1971-72, N=29)[a]

Area The Counselor:	Year	Number of Teachers Who Worked With Counselor N	%	Very Helpful N	%	Somewhat Helpful N	%	No Help N	%
1. Provided information about individual students	1970-71	26	96	11	42	14	54	1	4
	1971-72	29	100	16	57	12	43	0	0
2. Provided a resource for referral of students who needed special help	1970-71	23	85	4	17	15	65	4	17
	1971-72	23	82	9	39	14	61	0	0
3. Offered suggestions that helped me cope with students who were not adjusting to class	1970-71	24	89	3	13	18	75	3	13
	1971-72	28	97	14	50	13	46	1	4
4. Observed the classroom	1970-71	10	40	1	11	4	44	4	44
	1971-72	29	100	5	17	17	59	7	24
5. Actively participated in classroom activities and group discussions	1970-71	6	24	3	50	2	33	1	17
	1971-72	18	62	6	35	9	53	2	12
6. Participated with teachers in conferences concerning students with problems	1970-71	25	96	10	40	14	56	1	4
	1971-72	28	97	16	57	12	43	0	0
7. Suggested or cooperatively planned activities and methods to develop appropriate classroom atmosphere	1970-71	5	11	1	20	3	60	1	20
	1971-72	15	54	2	14	11	79	1	7
8. Suggested or cooperatively planned curriculum to meet the needs of students	1970-71	7	29	1	14	6	86	0	0
	1971-72	10	34	2	20	6	60	2	20

[a] In a few cases, teachers did not rate degree of help; helpfulness percentages were calculated on the basis of the number of teachers who rated helpfulness.

areas where the counselors had the most contact with teachers--providing information about students, providing a referral resource for special situations, offering suggestions to cope with students who were not adjusting to class, and participating in case conferences. Teachers' ratings of counselor helpfulness in these four areas were more favorable in 1971-72 than in 1970-71.

Seventh grade teachers rated the counselors as being more helpful in 1971-72 than in 1970-71. As indicated in Table 5, 55% of the teachers said the counselors were very helpful in 1971-72 compared with 12% in 1970-71.

Table 5

Jordan Teachers' Rating of Overall Counselor Helpfulness

	1970-71 N=26 Percent	1971-72 N=29 Percent
Very helpful	12%	55%
Somewhat helpful	61	41
Not very helpful	27	4
Of no help	0	0

Teacher Evaluation of the Program

Twenty-four teachers who had seventh grade assignments at Jordan in both 1970-71 and 1971-72 compared the seventh grade program for the two years on a number of variables. Where differences between the two years occurred, the 1971-72 seventh grade program received more favorable ratings than the 1970-71 program (Table 6 on page 13).

All 24 teachers said they had better contacts with counselors in 1971-72 than in the previous year. Eighty-seven percent of the teachers thought there was better communication between teachers and a greater staff togetherness in 1971-72 than in 1970-71. About one half of the teachers reported they had picked up more ideas from other teachers and were more interested in trying new ideas, methods, etc.

Three out of 4 teachers thought their referrals of students were handled more promptly this year, and half of the teachers said student referrals were handled more effectively. Fifty percent of the teachers indicated that communications between themselves and their students were better in 1971-72. The majority (79%) felt there was no difference in student input into the educational

Table 6

Jordan Teachers' Comparison of the 1970-71 and 1971-72 Seventh Grade Programs (N=24)

Program statement[a]	In 1970-71 Percent	In 1971-72 Percent	No Difference Percent
There was more communication between teachers	0%	87%	13%
There was greater staff togetherness	0	87	13
I picked up more ideas from other teachers	4	54	42
I was more interested in trying new ideas, methods, etc.	4	50	46
I had better contacts with counselors	0	100	0
My referrals of students were handled more effectively	13	52	35
My referrals of students were acted upon promptly	4	78	17
I handled more classroom behavior problems myself without making referrals	26	22	52
There was better communication between myself and students	0	46	54
I had more contacts with parents	9	38	54
Students had more input into the educational program	0	21	79
The student grading system was better	13	74	13

[a]Statements were not in this order on questionnaire

program in 1971-72 and 1970-71.

The new student grading system was favored by 74% of the responding teachers, while 13% preferred the grading system used in 1970-71.

Teachers made additional comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the new student evaluation system. The major strengths mentioned were that the new grading system more accurately and objectively described an individual student's progress, forced teachers to define what they were teaching, and was fairer to all students.

The major weakness noted was that the procedure was very time consuming. Other weaknesses mentioned were that good students missed the competition for letter grades and that it was difficult to determine the honor roll students.

Several teachers would like to have training in writing their classroom objectives in behavioral terms. Other suggested improvements were more behavior items related to positive characteristics such as creativity, self-concept, etc., and followup with parent conferences.

Changes in materials and methods. Teachers reported very few changes in methods and materials as a result of the new seventh grade structure. Several teachers said they did more planning using the objectives approach. Other changes mentioned by one or two teachers were more individualized instruction, more negotiations with students, more freedom to students because you knew student problems sooner, additional projects attempted, and use of counselor approach with behavior problems rather than threat of an assistant principal.

Counselor leadership. Teachers were asked whether or not this year's counselors had taken a leadership role in getting people to think about or make changes in the educational program. Without much elaboration, twelve respondents indicated that the counselors did provide leadership. Three teachers cited leadership from counselors on the report card change. Two teachers saw the counselors as effectively helping teachers get together and work on changes. Two others said that set ways by some staff members made it difficult for leadership to arise. One individual indicated that the role was too big for the counselors.

Suggested changes in the seventh grade program. In response to a request for suggested improvements, about half of the teachers wanted stronger discipline next year. Some felt an authority figure was needed and that counselors could not play a dual role.

A few teachers suggested that communications between teachers should be facilitated. Perhaps uncommitted teachers would become a part of the program, and strong-willed teachers would make some compromises.

Two teachers suggested more alternatives for students who were behavior problems, two suggested more social activities for seventh graders, and one each suggested interdisciplinary planning, less administrative work for counselors, and continued support for teachers.

Counselors' Views of the Project

The two Jordan counselors who worked in the project gave the following description of the changes in their role from their point of view.

- From occasional involvement with teacher-student problems in the previous year to almost complete involvement.
- From almost no involvement with student discipline in the previous year to almost complete responsibility.
- Acquisition of an administrative role in such areas as coordinating daily and weekly schedules of teacher activities, coordinating general school information, handling complaints and suggestions, and supervising the student council.
- From office-centered activities in the previous year to activities such as classroom visits, class meetings, and lunchroom assistance.
- Increase in communication with homes, agencies, and other schools.
- More case conferences with individual and groups of teachers.

How did the counselors feel about their role change? Generally quite good. Although they found their job more difficult, they felt more like they were a part of the school. They liked the feedback from the staff, and the increased communication with parents, but at times they felt the students were getting the short end of their time.

The counselors said it was difficult to be both the good guy and the bad guy. They were not sure that students could distinguish the discipline role from the counselor role. They found that students with serious behavior problems took a lot of their time and assistance from the administration next year with these students would be helpful.

Next year, the counselors would like to spend more time planning with teachers with more subsequent action and followup. They see a need to become effective in working with teachers. They also would like to have the teachers take a greater part in making decisions. This past year, the counselors felt

the teachers saw the counselors as the administrators and, therefore, the decision makers.

The counselors said the following benefits were related to the Reorganized Junior High Program.

- The new objective-based student evaluation system
- The new seventh grade office serving as a central source of seventh grade information
- The Dimension-7 bi-weekly publication for parents, students, and teachers
- Direct input into next year's master schedule from the seventh grade viewpoint
- Increase in the number of teachers who will be teaching at the seventh grade level only next year
- Opportunity (time and money) for teachers to plan a seventh grade curriculum

Student Perceptions of the Counselors

In May 1972 seventh grade students at Jordan were given a questionnaire that attempted to measure the kinds of contacts they had with their counselor, student perceptions of the counselor's job, and student perceptions of the counselor as a person. The questionnaire was completed by 298 students, or about 82% of the seventh grade student body.

The same questionnaire had been given to the eighth graders (1970-71 seventh graders) in September 1971. They were asked to complete the questionnaire for the counselor they had the previous year as seventh graders. Students who did not attend Jordan in the previous year were excluded. About 77%, or 337 students completed the questionnaire for the counselor they had the previous year as seventh graders.

Student contact with counselors. Seventh grade students had more talks with their counselor in his office in 1971-72 than in 1970-71 (Table 7 on page 17) In 1971-72, 25% of the students said they talked with their counselor five or more times during the year, while 16% said they never talked with their counselor In the previous year, the figures were 17% for five or more talks, and 26% for never talked with a counselor.

The counselors were also more visible to the students outside their office

Table 7

Amount of Contact Jordan Junior High Seventh Grade Students Had With Their Counselor in 1970-71 and 1971-72

Question	Response	1970-71 N=337 Percent	1971-72 N=298 Percent
How often have you talked with your counselor in his office this year?	Never	26%	16%
	One time	22	23
	2-5 times	35	37
	More than 5	17	25
Did you ever go to the counselor's office on your own...that is, when you were not sent or asked to come to his office?	Yes	49	49
	No	51	51
How often have you seen your counselor in the school hallways this year?	Almost every day	50	93
	About once a week	31	5
	About once a month	9	1
	Once or twice a year	6	1
	Never	5	0
How often has your counselor visited your classroom this year?	Almost every day	1	45
	About once a week	19	44
	About once a month	27	8
	Once or twice a year	34	2
	Never	19	1

this past year than in 1970-71. Ninety-three percent of the students in 1971-72, compared with 50% in 1970-71, reported that they saw their counselor in the school hallways almost every day. The students also noticed the increased number of classroom visits by the counselor in 1971-72. Eighty-nine percent of the 1971-72 seventh graders said their counselor visited their classroom once a week or more, compared with only 20% of the 1970-71 seventh graders.

The areas talked about in these student-counselor contacts were somewhat different in the two years (Table 8 on page 19). In 1971-72, there were substantially more talks than in 1970-71 regarding trouble with school rules and problems with other students.

As would be expected with the role of the counselor changed to assume responsibility for handling all student situations, more students in 1971-72 than in 1970-71 indicated that they talked with their counselor because they had broken the school rules (Table 9 on page 20). In the year previous to the project, 85% of the seventh graders said they never talked with the counselor because they had broken school rules. This past year during the project, 64% of the students made that statement.

Student-counselor talks about breaking school rules were apparently very different in 1970-71 and 1971-72 (Table 10 on page 20). Although more students in 1971-72 than in 1970-71 indicated that they were bawled out or suspended, it also appears that the talks were more constructive during the project year than in the previous year. In 1971-72, greater percentages of students felt that the counselor was interested in hearing what they had to say, said that they found it was their responsibility to stay out of trouble, and said that, with the counselor, they tried to figure out a way to stay out of trouble.

Student perceptions of the counselor's job. The 1970-71 and 1971-72 seventh graders had different perceptions of what activities were part of the counselor's job (Table 11 on page 21). The two major differences were related to the changed role of the counselor. Fifty-four percent of the 1971-72 students and 21% of the 1970-71 students thought it was the counselor's job to discipline students when they were in trouble. Similarly, 52% of the 1971-72 students compared with 19% of the 1970-71 students indicated that counselors suspend students when they are in trouble.

Table 8

Percentage of Student-Counselor Talks in Various Areas for Students Who Talked With Their Counselor at Jordan Junior High in 1970-71 and 1971-72

	1970-71 N=250 Percent	1971-72 N=249 Percent
My abilities, interests, test scores	16%	24%
Planning my classes for next year	6	5
Program changes for this year	34	28
Problems with school work	21	29
Understanding myself	21	24
Trouble I had with school rules	15	33
Problems I had with a teacher	37	39
Problems I had with other students	31	48
What kind of job I might have in later life	7	2
Just to talk awhile	29	30

Table 9

Percentage of Students in Grade Seven Who Talked With Their Counselor Because They Broke School Rules Jordan Junior High: 1970-71 and 1971-72

Question	Response	1970-71 N=337 Percent	1971-72 N=298 Percent
Have you ever talked with your counselor because you've broken the school rules?	Never	85%	64%
	One time	6	13
	2-5 times	7	12
	More than 5	2	11

Table 10

Seventh Grade Students' Description of Student-Counselor Talks About Breaking School Rules at Jordan Junior High: 1970-71 and 1971-72

Check any of the following that describes your talks with the counselor about breaking school rules	1970-71 N=51 Percent	1971-72 N=105 Percent
I was bawled out	18%	35%
The counselor was interested in hearing what I had to say	59	69
I was afraid when I left the counselor's office	8	11
Together we tried to figure out a way for me to stay out of trouble	20	70
I found out it was up to me if I was going to stay out of trouble	49	69
We had a nice talk about why I broke the rules	39	50
I was suspended	4	35

Table 11

Seventh Grade Students' Perceptions of the Counselor's Job at Jordan Junior High: 1970-71 and 1971-72

Are the following activities part of the counselor's job?	Response	1970-71 N=337 Percent	1971-72 N=298 Percent
Helps students get along with other students	Yes	73%	82%
	No	8	9
	Don't Know	19	10
Helps students plan and select their classes	Yes	54	52
	No	20	25
	Don't Know	25	23
Disciplines students when they're in trouble	Yes	21	54
	No	51	29
	Don't Know	27	17
Helps students understand themselves	Yes	70	68
	No	9	16
	Don't Know	21	16
Helps students improve their schoolwork	Yes	50	49
	No	24	27
	Don't Know	26	24
Helps teachers grade the students	Yes	9	13
	No	58	58
	Don't Know	34	29
Suspends students when they're in trouble	Yes	19	52
	No	45	26
	Don't Know	36	22
Helps students who have personal and social concerns such as feeling left out, shyness, trouble with family...	Yes	60	54
	No	14	24
	Don't Know	25	22
Helps students get along with teachers	Yes	68	68
	No	9	19
	Don't Know	22	13

On the other activities listed in Table 11, the percentages for the two years were quite similar, although 82% of the project year's students, compared with 73% of the previous year's students, said it was the counselor's job to help students get along with other students.

Student perceptions of the counselor as a person. Students in 1970-71 and 1971-72 responded to 19 items concerning the relationship they had with their counselor and how they perceived him as a person (Table 12 on pages 23 and 24). The items were put in six categories based on judgement of similar content: understanding, interest-concern, liking, control-manipulation, congruence, and approach.

Compared with students in 1970-71, the 1971-72 seventh graders had less favorable attitudes towards their counselor and the counseling relationship. Sixty-four percent of this year's seventh graders, compared with 82% of the 1970-71 seventh graders, agreed that their counselor "understands me." About 10% fewer students in 1971-72 than in 1970-71 indicated that their counselor was "interested" in how they looked at things.

The greatest difference between the two years occurred on the items grouped in the "Liking" category. About 20% more 1970-71 than 1971-72 students said that they liked talking with their counselor and that their counselor was friendly. Only 9% of the students in 1970-71, compared with 32% in 1971-72, said their counselor doesn't seem to like them very much.

Although in both years the majority of the students reported that their counselor usually lets them decide what to do and tries to get them to be responsible for what they do, more 1971-72 students than 1970-71 students said their counselor tells his opinions more than they want to know them and likes to tell people what to do. Students in 1970-71 also perceived their counselor as more genuine and as more approachable.

Overall student rating of counselor helpfulness. On an overall student rating of counselor helpfulness, there was some difference between 1970-71 and 1971-72 seventh graders (Table 13, page 25). Although a somewhat higher percentage of seventh graders in 1970-71 (45%) than in 1971-72 (37%) rated counselors as very helpful to students, the percentages of students who said the counselors were helpful to students were very similar for the two years (71% in 1970-71, and 74% in 1971-72).

Table 12

Seventh Grade Students' Perceptions of the Counselor at Jordan Junior High: 1970-71 and 1971-72

	Response	1970-71 N=337 Percent	1971-72 N=298 Percent
Understanding			
He tries to see things the way I do and to understand how I feel	Strongly Agree	23%	21%
	Agree	63	50
	Disagree	12	15
	Strongly Disagree	2	15
He understands me	Strongly Agree	21	15
	Agree	61	49
	Disagree	12	24
	Strongly Disagree	6	11
Interest-Concern			
He is interested in knowing how I look at things	Strongly Agree	16%	19%
	Agree	67	55
	Disagree	14	16
	Strongly Disagree	3	10
He hurries me through when I talk with him	Strongly Agree	5	12
	Agree	9	13
	Disagree	58	52
	Strongly Disagree	27	23
I often feel that he has more important things to do when I am talking to him	Strongly Disagree	5	17
	Agree	24	28
	Disagree	45	41
	Strongly Disagree	25	14
Liking			
He doesn't seem to like me very much	Strongly Agree	3%	13%
	Agree	6	19
	Disagree	61	45
	Strongly Disagree	31	23
I feel comfortable talking with the counselor about myself.	Strongly Agree	15	9
	Agree	45	33
	Disagree	31	34
	Strongly Disagree	9	23
He is friendly toward me	Strongly Agree	31	20
	Agree	63	58
	Disagree	4	13
	Strongly Disagree	3	10
I like talking with my counselor	Strongly Agree	22	13
	Agree	58	43
	Disagree	15	22
	Strongly Disagree	5	23

Table 12(continued)

		1970-71 N=337 Percent	1971-72 N=298 Percent
Control-Manipulative			
He likes to tell people what to do	Strongly Agree	4%	17%
	Agree	22	30
	Disagree	56	41
	Strongly Disagree	18	12
He tells his opinions more than I want to know them	Strongly Agree	5	18
	Agree	23	27
	Disagree	62	45
	Strongly Disagree	10	11
He always gives me a chance to explain my side of things	Strongly Agree	25	23
	Agree	62	56
	Disagree	8	12
	Strongly Disagree	4	9
He usually tells me what I should do rather than letting me decide for myself	Strongly Agree	6	17
	Agree	26	21
	Disagree	54	47
	Strongly Disagree	14	15
He tries to get me to be responsible for what I do	Strongly Agree	10	16
	Agree	56	49
	Disagree	29	27
	Strongly Disagree	5	8
Congruence			
It is hard for me to know what he is really like as a person	Strongly Agree	8%	13%
	Agree	39	42
	Disagree	42	37
	Strongly Disagree	11	8
I feel that he is honest with me; he says what he <u>really</u> thinks or feels	Strongly Agree	21	22
	Agree	64	52
	Disagree	12	17
	Strongly Disagree	3	9
Approach			
I am afraid to go to the counselor when I am in trouble in school	Strongly Agree	6%	9%
	Agree	15	21
	Disagree	54	45
	Strongly Disagree	25	25
I would go to the counselor on my own if I needed help	Strongly Agree	32	27
	Agree	55	50
	Disagree	8	14
	Strongly Disagree	4	9
Being called to the counselor probably means I have done something wrong	Strongly Agree	5	16
	Agree	20	25
	Disagree	54	45
	Strongly Disagree	21	15

Table 13

Overall Rating of Counselor Helpfulness by Jordan Seventh Grade Students in 1970-71 and 1971-72

	1970-71 N=337 Percent	1971-72 N=298 Percent
Very helpful to students	45%	37%
Sometimes helpful to students	26	37
Of no help to students	2	3
More harmful than helpful to students	2	5
I don't know	25	18

Student preference for grading systems. The 1971-72 seventh graders at Jordan preferred the old A, B, C, D, F evaluation format over the new format developed during the Reorganized Junior High project and put into use the second half of the year. Sixty-one percent of the students expressed preference for the old system, 16% preferred the new system, and 22% said it did not make any difference.

Student Attitudes Toward School and Teachers

Did the seventh grade students at Jordan Junior High respond positively toward school and their teachers? In May 1972 the seventh graders were given the Student Opinion Questionnaire, a 93-item instrument developed by the Minneapolis Schools' Research and Evaluation Department to measure student attitudes toward various aspects of school. Several factors, or groups of items that appear to be measuring the same concept, had been identified previously. Three groups of items related to the objectives of the Reorganized Junior High Program were labeled Liking of School, Interest in Learning, and Class Discussions. Comparison data from the 1970-71 seventh grade students were available.

Table 14 on page 26 gives the responses of 1970-71 and 1971-72 Jordan seventh graders to the items in the three groups. Each student marked one of four choices for each item: strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. The "Percent Agree" total in Table 14 is the percentage of students who chose either strongly agree or agree. About half of the students responded

Table 14

Jordan Seventh Graders' Attitudes Toward School in 1970-71 and 1971-72

Factor and Items	Percent Agree May 1971 N=369	Percent Agree May 1972 N=296
Liking of School		
Schoolwork is interesting	59%	56%
I like school	51	49
My classes are boring	58	53
I think school is fun	43	49
I don't like school work	56	56
I like my classes	52	57
Interest in Learning		
I really don't care whether I learn anything or not	16	10
I enjoy learning new things	79	90
I would like to quit school	28	22
Class Discussions		
I enjoy being in class discussions	-[a]	57
The lectures and class discussions by my teachers are clear and worthwhile	43	66
I don't understand my class discussions	35	24
I don't find class discussions fun or exciting	53	53

[a]This item was not given in May 1971

positively to the Liking-of-School items. For example, 56% of the students said schoolwork was interesting and 49% said they liked school. Differences between the 1971-72 and 1970-71 students on these items were not substantial.

The 1971-72 students responded somewhat more positively than the 1970-71 students to the three Interest-in-Learning items, although in both years, the responses to these three items were positive. Ninety percent of the 1971-72 students said they enjoyed learning new things, compared with 79% of the 1970-71 students.

Class discussions were viewed more favorably by the project students than by students in the previous year. Sixty-six percent of the 1971-72 students, compared with 43% of the 1970-71 students, said the lectures and class discussions by their teachers were clear and worthwhile.

Several items on the Student Opinion Questionnaire are related to teachers, although a definite statistical factor has not been identified. The project year students responded more positively than the previous year students to eleven of the twelve items (Table 15 on page 28). As an example, 57% of the students in 1971-72, compared with 49% in 1970-71, said most of their teachers were excellent. However, on an absolute scale, relationships between students and teachers, as measured by these items, were not overwhelmingly positive. Only fifty-five percent of the seventh graders said they thought their teachers understood them.

Parent and Student Involvement

Other than increased written communications to all parents and increased contact with individual parents reported by the counselors and some of the teachers, there was no evidence that the amount of parent involvement and parent input into the seventh grade program was greater in 1971-72 than in previous years.

There also was no record of any activities that indicated that student involvement and input into the school was greater in 1971-72 than in previous years. Although the seventh grade staff discussed increased student involvement through the development of extra-curricular activities and student government, their ideas were not put into action. As indicated in Table 16 on page 29, about half of the students said they participated in decisions regarding

Table 15

Jordan Seventh Graders' Attitudes Toward
Their Teachers in 1970-71 and 1971-72

Item	Percent Agree May 1971 N=369	Percent Agree May 1972 N=296
I think my teachers understand me	61%	55%
Most of my teachers seem to like me	70	73
Most of my teachers are excellent	49	57
I find my teachers to be fun and exciting	39	42
I can get help from most teachers	74	85
I like most of my teachers	71	75
Teachers in this school do a poor job	30	26
My teachers really know how to teach	51	61
Most of my teachers are not considerate of how students feel	58	52
If students don't learn here, it is not the fault of the teachers	63	74
Teachers at this school really seem to enjoy teaching	54	65
My teachers don't treat me like a human being	32	18

Table 16

Jordan Seventh Graders' Opinions About Their Input in the School Program in 1970-71 and 1971-72

Item	Percent Agree May 1971 N=369	Percent Agree May 1972 N=296
Nobody is really interested in my opinions about how this school should be run	65%	56%
I help make decisions in my classes	52	47
Sometimes I help decide what our class does	50	38
I am never involved in making decisions about my school or class	42	45
My teacher never asks me to help plan what our class does	-	60
Many times students are given a chance to decide what the class does	-	47

what they did in their classrooms. The responses were somewhat less favorable in 1971-72 than in 1970-71.

Jordan Summary and Recommendations

A major component of the Reorganized Junior High Program at Jordan Junior High involved changing the role of the seventh grade counselor from a supportive referral person for individual students and staff members to a coordinator and facilitator of the seventh grade program as well.

Frequent counselor-teacher meetings were one of the main activities aimed at achieving the objectives of the project. The counselors organized a number of staff workshops and they met frequently with groups of teachers in the seventh grade office. However, some other factors hindered the development of a seventh grade program that would better meet the needs of students. About half of the seventh grade teachers actively participated in the workshop and meetings. Also, the master teacher schedule did not adequately permit teachers with common subjects, common students, or common interests to meet during the school day. Although few changes in the seventh grade curriculum and program were made during the year, the staff developed a new student evaluation system, set objectives for the coming year, and provided input into the coming year's

master schedule. Teacher said that, compared with previous years, communications among staff were better, that they picked up more ideas from others, and that they were more interested in trying new ideas and methods. Recommendation: if changes in the seventh grade program are to occur, provisions should be made for common teacher meeting times in the master teaching schedule, and efforts should be made to involve all seventh grade teachers.

Teacher opinions of counselor effectiveness were much better in 1971-72 than in 1970-71. Ninety-six percent of the responding teachers said counselors were helpful in 1971-72, compared with 73% in 1970-71. Fifty-five percent of the teachers said counselors were very helpful in 1971-72, compared with 12% in 1970-71. Each teacher had five or more contacts with the counselors in the following areas: provided information about individual students, provided a referral source for students who needed special help, offered suggestions that helped me cope with students who were not adjusting to class, observed the classroom, and participated in conferences concerning students with problems. Teacher ratings of counselor helpfulness tended to be more favorable in 1971-72 than in 1970-71. Recommendation: counselors should continue their efforts to work with other staff members.

Students had somewhat more contact with counselors in 1971-72 than in 1970-71. Changes in the type of student-counselor contacts occurred that reflected the changed role of the counselor. Students had more talks with their counselor about breaking school rules and about problems with other students in 1971-72 than in 1970-71. More than half of the students in 1971-72, compared with one-fifth of the 1970-71 students, said it was the counselor's job to discipline and suspend students when they were in trouble.

Students in the project year had less favorable attitudes toward their counselor and the counseling relationship than did students in the previous year. A greater percentage of students in 1970-71 than in 1971-72 said their counselor seemed to like and understand them. About twenty percent more 1970-71 students than 1971-72 students said they liked talking with their counselor. The counselors also expressed a concern about their role as disciplinarians. Recommendation: special attention should be focused on the relationships between students and counselors. Perhaps it is not possible for counselors to effectively assume both the role of disciplinarian and the role of the accepting counselor. Or, perhaps, the dual roles could be handled

effectively if the counselors made adjustments in their behavior.

Provisions for parent and student involvement in the seventh grade program were not increased during the project year. Students indicated that they had less involvement in classroom decision making in 1971-72 than in 1970-71. Recommendation: provisions should be made to increase the involvement of parents and students in program development.

Marshall-University Component

The Marshall-University component of the Reorganized Junior High Program was organized differently than the Jordan component. Several Marshall-University teachers had previous experience with teacher-counselor team approaches and were expecting to work as part of a team in 1971-72. Unfortunately, the Marshall-University teachers were not aware that the Title III program had been funded and that objectives related to the counselor's role were one of the major parts of the program. This lack of communication resulted in some confrontations between the project administrator, the counselors, and the team teachers at the beginning of the school year.

After working through some of these problems and associated feelings, teacher-counselor teams were set up to work with half of the students in each of grades seven and eight. At each grade level the team consisted of a counselor and four teachers, one each from English, mathematics, science, and social studies. At the beginning of the year, it was made clear that the counselor was seen as one of the team members and not as any greater facilitator or coordinator than any of the other team members. Both the seventh grade and eighth grade team counselors were first-year counselors. The counselors also were assigned to work with the other students in seventh and eighth grade who were not on the teams.

Approximately 90 students on each team were selected randomly from the student populations. The mean scores of the team and non-team seventh graders on the Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test given in the fall of 1971 were not significantly different, nor did the team and non-team eighth graders differ significantly on the vocabularly and reading comprehension subtests of the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test. These students came from a wide variety of backgrounds. Marshall-University, located in southeast Minneapolis, not only serves a neighborhood that is diverse in economic and educational attainments,

but draws transfer students from the entire metropolitan area. One-third of the 1200 students at the school were transfer students. Minority group students comprised 16 percent and handicapped students 8 percent of the total student body.

The schedule for the team students and team teachers permitted some flexible scheduling. The ninety students in each team were divided into four groups. Each team student was scheduled into English, math, science, and social studies in four consecutive 45-minute periods during the same three hours with the same teachers and with the same group of students in each class. In the sample schedule below, the four groups of students are designated A, B, C, D.

	Periods			
	1	2	3	4
English	A	D	C	B
Math	B	A	D	C
Science	C	B	A	D
Social Studies	D	C	B	A

The two most obvious advantages of this schedule were that the team teachers had the same students, and the classes could easily be reorganized within time periods or across time periods to meet instructional needs, such as interdisciplinary activities and field trips.

Evaluation of Process Objectives

A number of activities and procedures were listed in the proposal whose fulfillment would hopefully lead to attainment of the major outcomes or product objectives. Were the activities carried out?

Process Objectives 1 and 2: Workshops

The counselors for both the seventh and eighth grade teams kept logbooks of their team's workshops. The eighth grade team had seven workshops during the year. Two of these workshops (one for an entire week) were supported by funds from Southeast Alternatives, a federally-funded experimental schools project that encompassed all of southeast Minneapolis.

The eighth grade team outlined goals for each of the workshops and usually evaluated their progress toward these goals at the end of each workshop. During the early part of the year the team discussed student government, a career

development unit, interdisciplinary units, behavior modification, and developed a student evaluation system that required written letters to parents with input from all team members.

At a one-week planning session in December, where substitute teachers took over their classes, the eighth grade team developed an interdisciplinary unit on decision making, started a new evaluation form to replace the time-consuming method of writing letters, had a meeting with parents, contacted non-team staff members, and further discussed mini-units. At two later workshops the team developed the new evaluation system (see copy in Appendix A), developed an evaluation form for the mini-units they had installed in the program, and developed a summer proposal and a plan for next year to include all eighth grade academic teachers in the team organization.

Early in the school year the eighth grade team listed the following objectives for the 1971-72 school year.

- Develop cooperation of the staff within the team meeting
- Analyze and develop interdisciplinary approaches
- Change from traditional grading system to individual progress report based on team evaluations
- Anticipate and correct student problems
- Foster a positive attitude toward school and a positive self concept in the team students
- Develop reinforcement techniques
- Involve students in curriculum planning
- Involve parents in the school program
- Develop trust and understanding between students and teachers
- Develop program flexibility within the current operating schedule

The seventh grade team had fewer workshops than the eighth grade team. During their workshops they discussed interdisciplinary activities, developed a new student evaluation form (copy in Appendix A), and spent some time working on better communications between team members. A consultant from the University of Minnesota helped them study their group's process.

The seventh grade team members stated the following general purposes of the seventh grade team.

- To work cohesively as a team
- To better understand students and meet their individual needs by case conferences, changes in scheduling, sharing of teacher methods and techniques, and staff development

- To develop acceptance of the team within the school community
- To develop interdisciplinary activities

Process Objective 3: Classroom visits

On a questionnaire completed in May 1972, all eight team teachers reported that the counselor visited their classroom five or more times during the 1971-72 school year (Table 17 on page 37).

Process Objective 4: Coordinate support services

Although an assistant principal was assigned to the junior high students, both the seventh and eighth grade teams coordinated the support services for the team students. The teams usually made the decision regarding the handling of individual team students, although they regularly consulted with other support personnel in the school; social workers, school psychologists, the reading teacher, and administrators.

Process Objectives 5 and 7: Meet with the teacher teams

Team meetings were the core of the Reorganized Junior High Program at Marshall-University. The four teachers on each team had a common preparation time every day before they met with their four team classes. With few exceptions the team teachers and the team counselor met daily during this common time. Logbooks of these daily team meetings were kept by the counselors.

Much of the seventh grade team meeting time was spent discussing individual team students. Team conferences to share techniques and to coordinate teaching strategies were a common subject of team meetings. Parents of students and other resources such as social workers, school pyschologists, administrators, and other specialists were included frequently. Some team meetings were spent developing the new evaluation system, discussing interdisciplinary approaches, planning for next year, and generally trying to relate to each other as group members.

The logbook of eighth grade team meetings was kept very diligently by the eighth grade counselor. The logbook indicated the purpose of each daily meeting and listed the activities that occurred. Five of the early meetings were devoted to a discussion and identificiation of the team's objectives for the year. Throughout the remainder of the year the following activities were noted in the logbook. The number of meetings at which activity occurred is given in parentheses.

- Conferences regarding individual students; other support personnel and parents were included frequently (32 meetings)
- Discussion of techniques for handling groups of students, including behavior modification (7)
- Development of proposals for next year and summer (18)
- Discussion of workshop plans (3)
- Discussion of group schedule changes to permit field trips, mini-units, other options (18)
- Development of teamwork with other support services (5)
- Development of new student evaluation system (7)
- Work on individual student evaluations (14)
- Plans for increased parent involvement (3)
- Evaluation of team activities (6)
- Discussion of group processes within the team; guidelines for operation, interpersonal feelings (6)
- Discussion of team plans with administration (2)
- Explanation of program to visitors (8)

The preceding activities occurred during the team's common prep time. Each counselor also met with the team or subgroups of the team at other times during the school day.

The four eighth grade non-team teachers in English, math, science, and social studies became interested in working as a team and actually began meeting as a team with the eighth grade counselor during the last quarter of the school year.

Process Objective 6: Dissemination

Although the teams at Marshall-University did not distribute any regular bulletins describing their activities, articles were printed in the school newspaper and the Southeast Alternatives newsletter.

Evaluation of Product Objectives

The following sections will discuss the attainment of the project's product objectives: increased counselor effectiveness as perceived by teachers and students; improved student attitudes toward school and teachers; and increased parent and student involvement in the program.

Teacher Evaluation of Counselor Effectiveness

All seventh and eighth grade teachers were asked in September 1971 to

estimate the number of contacts they had with counselors during the previous 1970-71 school year. In May 1972 the same teachers were asked to make similar estimates for the 1971-72 school year. The 1971-72 counselors and the 1970-71 counselors were not the same individuals. More than ninety percent of all teachers with at least one seventh or eighth grade class responded.

The combined estimates by seventh and eighth grade teachers were separated into three groups: all 1970-71 teachers, 1971-72 team teachers, and 1971-72 non-team teachers (Table 17 on page 37). The frequency of teacher-counselor contacts reported by the 1971-72 team teachers was greater than that reported by 1971-72 non-team teachers and 1970-71 teachers in all listed areas. The contacts reported by the latter two groups were fairly similar. All eight team teachers reported five or more contacts with the counselors in the following areas: provided information about individual students, participated in conferences concerning students with problems, and suggested or cooperatively planned activities and methods to develop appropriate classroom atmosphere. The team teachers reported at least one contact with counselors in the other listed areas, including four team teachers who said the counselor helped plan the curriculum at least five times.

The teachers also indicated whether or not they thought teachers and counselors should work together in each of the areas (Table 18 on page 38). The three groups of teachers almost unanimously agreed on the appropriateness of the counselor's role in the more traditional areas 1, 2, 3, and 6. About 80% of each group said counselors should observe the classroom, and about half said counselor should actively participate in classroom activities. A greater percentage of 1971-72 team teachers (86%) than either 1971-72 non-team teachers (about 60%) or 1970-71 teachers (about 60%) said counselors should suggest or cooperatively plan curriculum and should help plan activities to develop an appropriate classroom atmosphere.

Most 1970-71 and 1971-72 teachers who worked with the counselors in the eight listed areas indicated that the counselor was helpful (Table 19 on page 39). The counselors were rated as more helpful by the 1971-72 team teachers than by the other 1971-72 and 1970-71 teachers in the three pupil personnel service areas: providing information about individual students, providing a referral resource for students who need special help, and participating in conferences concerning students with problems. The counselors were rated somewhat less helpful by the 1971-72 team teachers than by the 1970-71 teachers in

Table 17

Frequency That Counselors Worked with Marshall-University Teachers in Several Areas as Reported by the Teachers

(1970-71, N=35; 1971-72 Team Teachers, N=8; 1971-72 NonTeam Teachers, N=36)[a]

Area / The Counselor:	Year	More Than Ten Times		5-10 Times		Once or Twice		Never	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Provided information about individual students	1970-71	9	26%	13	37%	8	23%	5	14%
	1971-72 Team	7	88	1	13	0	0	0	0
	1971-72 NonTeam	13	36	15	42	6	17	2	6
2. Provided a resource for referral of students who needed special help	1970-71	3	9	9	26	13	37	10	29
	1971-72 Team	4	50	2	25	2	25	0	0
	1971-72 NonTeam	1	3	9	26	21	60	4	11
3. Offered suggestions that helped me cope with students who were not adjusting to class	1970-71	4	11	5	14	15	43	11	31
	1971-72 Team	3	38	3	38	2	25	0	0
	1971-72 NonTeam	1	3	10	28	19	53	6	17
4. Observed the classroom	1970-71	5	14	3	9	7	20	20	57
	1971-72 Team	3	38	3	38	2	25	0	0
	1971-72 NonTeam	0	0	4	11	9	26	22	63
5. Actively participated in classroom activities and group discussions	1970-71	0	0	2	6	6	17	27	77
	1971-72 Team	0	0	1	13	5	63	2	25
	1971-72 NonTeam	0	0	0	0	5	14	30	86
6. Participated with teachers in conferences concerning students with problems	1970-71	5	14	10	29	12	34	8	23
	1971-72 Team	8	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1971-72 NonTeam	4	11	4	11	20	57	7	20
7. Suggested or cooperatively planned activities and methods to develop appropriate classroom atmosphere	1970-71	1	3	1	3	3	9	30	86
	1971-72 Team	3	38	5	63	0	0	0	0
	1971-72 NonTeam	1	3	2	6	6	17	27	75
8. Suggested or cooperatively planned curriculum to meet the needs of students	1970-71	2	6	2	6	3	9	27	79
	1971-72 Team	1	13	3	38	4	50	0	0
	1971-72 NonTeam	2	6	3	9	5	15	24	71

[a]Some teachers did not respond to all areas: therefore, Ns will not always equal 35, 8, and 36

Table 18

1970-71 and 1971-72 Opinions of Marshall-University Teachers as to Whether Counselors and Teachers Should Work Together in Several Areas

(1970-71, N=35; 1971-72 Team Teachers, N=8; 1971-72 NonTeam Teachers, N=36)

Area The Counselor	Year	Yes		No		No Answer
		N	%	N	%	N
1. Provided information about individual students	1970-71	34	100%	0	0%	1
	1971-72 Team	7	100	0	0	1
	1971-72 NonTeam	33	97	1	3	2
2. Provided a resource for referral of students who needed special help	1970-71	33	100	0	0	2
	1971-72 Team	7	100	0	0	1
	1971-72 NonTeam	29	97	1	3	6
3. Offered suggestions that helped me cope with students who were not adjusting to class	1970-71	31	97	1	3	3
	1971-72 Team	7	100	0	0	1
	1971-72 NonTeam	32	97	1	3	3
4. Observed the classroom	1970-71	22	79	6	21	7
	1971-72 Team	6	86	1	14	1
	1971-72 NonTeam	25	83	5	17	6
5. Actively participated in classroom activities and group discussions	1970-71	12	46	14	54	9
	1971-72 Team	4	57	3	43	1
	1971-72 NonTeam	14	56	11	44	11
6. Participated with teachers in conferences concerning students with problems	1970-71	31	100	0	0	4
	1971-72 Team	7	100	0	0	1
	1971-72 NonTeam	30	97	1	3	5
7. Suggested or cooperatively planned activities and methods to develop appropriate classroom atmosphere	1970-71	17	61	11	39	7
	1971-72 Team	6	86	1	14	1
	1971-72 NonTeam	12	50	12	50	12
8. Suggested or cooperatively planned curriculum to meet the needs of students	1970-71	18	64	10	36	7
	1971-72 Team	6	86	1	14	1
	1971-72 NonTeam	15	60	10	40	11

Table 19

Helpfulness of Counselors in Several Areas as Reported by Marshall-University Teachers Who Worked with the Counselor at Least Once in That Area

(1970-71, N=35; 1971-72 Team Teachers, N=8; 1971-72 NonTeam Teachers, N=36)[a]

Area The Counselor:	Year	Number of Teachers Who Worked With Counselor N	%	Very Helpful N	%	Somewhat Helpful N	%	No Help N	%
1. Provided information about individual students	1970-71	30	86%	15	50%	12	40%	3	10%
	1971-72 Team	8	100	7	88	1	13	0	0
	1971-72 NonTeam	34	94	21	62	11	32	2	6
2. Provided a resource for referral of students who needed special help	1970-71	25	71	9	36	14	56	2	8
	1971-72 Team	8	100	5	63	3	38	0	0
	1971-72 NonTeam	31	89	13	45	14	48	2	7
3. Offered suggestions that helped me cope with students who were not adjusting to class	1970-71	24	69	8	33	15	63	1	4
	1971-72 Team	8	100	2	25	6	75	0	0
	1971-72 NonTeam	30	83	11	37	16	53	3	10
4. Observed the classroom	1970-71	15	43	5	36	5	36	4	27
	1971-72 Team	8	100	1	13	3	38	4	50
	1971-72 NonTeam	13	37	2	15	10	77	1	8
5. Actively participated in classroom activities and group discussions	1970-71	8	23	5	71	2	29	0	0
	1971-72 Team	6	75	2	33	4	67	0	0
	1971-72 NonTeam	5	14	1	20	4	80	0	0
6. Participated with teachers in conferences concerning students with problems	1970-71	27	77	11	41	14	52	2	7
	1971-72 Team	8	100	7	88	1	13	0	0
	1971-72 NonTeam	28	80	13	48	11	41	3	11
7. Suggested or cooperatively planned activities and methods to develop appropriate classroom atmosphere	1970-71	5	14	1	20	3	60	1	20
	1971-72 Team	8	100	3	38	5	63	0	0
	1971-72 NonTeam	9	25	3	33	5	56	1	11
8. Suggested or cooperatively planned curriculum to meet the needs of students	1970-71	7	21	4	57	3	43	0	0
	1971-72 Team	8	100	3	38	3	38	2	25
	1971-72 NonTeam	10	29	6	60	4	40	0	0

[a] In a few cases, teachers did not rate degree of help; helpfulness percentages were calculated on the basis of the number of teachers who rated helpfulness.

the classroom observation and classroom participation areas. Two of the 1971-72 team teachers did not think the counselor had been helpful in planning curriculum to meet the needs of students.

The counselors were rated as more helpful by 1971-72 team teachers than by either 1971-72 non-team or 1970-71 teachers on a general helpfulness question. As indicated in Table 20, 75% of the team teachers said the counselors were very helpful, compared with 56% of the 1971-72 non-team teachers and 27% of the 1970-71 teachers.

Table 20

Marshall-Univeristy Seventh and Eighth Grade Teacher Ratings of Overall Counselor Helpfulness

	All Teachers 1970-71 N=33 Percent	Team 1971-72 N=8 Percent	NonTeam 1971-72 N=36 Percent
Very helpful	27%	75%	56%
Somewhat helpful	45	25	28
Not very helpful	21	0	17
Of no help	6	0	0

The counselor as a team member. Seven of the eight team teachers were interviewed individually by the evaluator at the end of the year. All seven teachers said that the counselor was a necessary and a useful member of the team. As a team member the counselor contributed information about students, provided a viewpoint from outside the classroom, and shared information obtained from teachers who were not on the team. The counselor served as a liaison to parents, administrators, and to outside referral sources. He also followed through on individuals or situations, and scheduled appointments and conferences. Some teachers indicated that the counselor was more effective in the team role than in the more traditional role. One teacher said the counselor was in their pitching with the teachers.

The team teachers did not feel the counselor should have any special skills that the rest of the team members did not have. They felt all team members, including the counselor, should have interpersonal skills that would facilitate the operation of the team. Although the teachers felt the counselor facilitated

the team functioning this year, they did not think the counselor should assume the leadership role in this area. In fact they did not think the team would function as effectively if the counselor were to assume a dominant role. At the time the evaluator interviewed the teachers, some negative feelings were expressed by some team members because one of the counselors had assumed the role of leader and was too dominant in the team meetings.

Team Teacher Reactions to the Project

Would the teachers like to be on a team again next year? All seven teachers said they would, although two of the seven said they would like to be given a choice rather than being assigned to the team without asking them if they would like to participate.

Strengths of team approach. In discussing the strengths of the team approach, all teachers felt the team organization improved staff relationships. Individuals cited the following strengths: teacher togetherness rather than isolation, group rapport and support, team spirit, and stronger voice as a team than as individuals.

All teachers felt that the team approach helped meet the needs of some students, particularly in the pupil personnel services area. Teachers received more information on individual students and were able to see the students from different viewpoints. This sharing of information resulted in a unified approach to individual students.

Most team teachers said they had more contact with parents this year than in previous years through case conferences with parents, telephone calls, and written communications.

Most teachers did not alter their group instructional techniques as a result of being team members, although several said they modified their treatment of individuals as a result of sharing viewpoints with other team members.

Few changes were made in the curriculum. Each team tried an interdisciplinary activity, but they did not feel they were successful. Some teachers said they coordinated their subject material to avoid overlap with and to build on other subject areas. Most changes were related to how the material was taught (mini-units for example) rather than changes in material and content. Most teachers felt the team was too busy with pupil personnel problems and group maintenance functions to find enough time to plan curriculum changes.

Problems and suggested improvements. The team teachers mentioned a number of problems with the team arrangement and suggested improvements for next year. Although the team spent some time dealing with group process during the year, several teachers indicated that more time should be given to interpersonal relationships among team members, and that team members needed to develop better interpersonal skills (possibly with outside assistance to the team). The daily, close team interactions led to conflicts that had to be resolved for the team to function effectively. Apparently some of these conflicts were not dealt with adequately.

Three of the teachers suggested fewer team meetings next year. They felt that if the team met fewer times per week, or only when necessary, productivity would increase.

The team also felt they would have more time to work on other activities if more resources for handling problem students were available. Several teachers expressed the need for a special learning and behavior problem (SLBP) teacher at the junior high level.

Several teachers indicated some frustration in relation to the personal and time committments they had made to the project. As stated by one individual, they had "experienced the risk of failure." A "team versus the administration" feeling was expressed by some teachers. The team's morale was down toward the end of the year when they felt their proposals for the coming year were meeting resistance from the administration.

Some teachers would like to spend more team time next year on curriculum activities such as interdisciplinary planning, team teaching, and expansion of the team to other subject areas.

Student Perceptions of the Counselor

Both the team and non-team seventh and eighth graders at Marshall-University completed a questionnaire in May 1972 that attempted to measure the kinds of contacts they had with their counselor and the students' perceptions of the counselor as a person. The same questionnaire had been given to the 1970-71 seventh graders in May 1971. Data for the 1970-71 eighth grade students was not collected.

Student contact with counselors. The frequency of student contact with counselors was about the same in 1971-72 as in 1970-71 (Table 21 on page 43). The

Table 21

Amount of Contact Marshall-University Seventh and Eighth Grade Students Had With Their Counselor in 1970-71 and 1971-72

Question	Response	1970-71 Grade 7 N=138	1971-72 Grade 7 Team N=75	1971-72 Grade 7 Non Team N=65	1971-72 Grade 8 Team N=74	1971-72 Grade 8 Non Team N=58
How often have you talked with your counselor in his office this year?	Never	8%	23%	22%	11%	5%
	One time	25	29	23	22	9
	2-5 times	49	32	38	46	66
	More than 5	18	16	17	22	21
Did you ever go to the counselor's office on your own...that is, when you were not sent or asked to come to his office?	Yes	59	64	60	64	57
	No	41	36	40	36	43
How often have you seen your counselor in the school hallways this year?	Almost every day	58	48	34	79	90
	About once a week	31	35	55	18	7
	About once a month	5	12	8	1	0
	Once or twice a year	5	3	3	1	3
	Never	1	3	0	0	0
How often has your counselor visited your classroom this year?	Almost every day	9	1	2	1	4
	About once a week	36	25	20	23	56
	About once a month	33	40	62	67	28
	Once or twice a year	21	28	17	9	11
	Never	1	5	0	0	2

1971-72 eighth graders reported somewhat more contact with their counselor in 1971-72 than they did as seventh graders in 1970-71, while the 1971-72 seventh graders reported less contact with counselors than that reported by seventh graders in 1970-71. For example, 23% of the 1971-72 seventh graders said they never talked with their counselor in his office (8% in 1970-71), about 41% in 1971-72 said they saw their counselor in the school hallways almost every day (58% in 1970-71), and 23% in 1971-72 said their counselor visited their classroom once a week or more (45% in 1970-71). There were no differences between seventh grade team and non-team students, while the amount of counselor contact reported by eighth grade non-team students was greater than that reported by team students.

Student perceptions of the counselor as a person. Seventh grade students in 1970-71 and both seventh and eighth grade students in 1971-72 responded to 19 items that measured the students' perceptions of the counseling relationship and the counselor as a person (Table 22 on pages 45 and 46). The items were placed in six categories based on judgement of similar content: understanding, interest-concern, liking, control-manipulation, congruence, and approach.

The counselors were viewed somewhat more favorably by the team students than by the non-team students, particularly in the seventh grade. Although the differences were small on many items, the seventh grade team students consistently responded more favorably than the non-team students on all items. As examples, 83% of the team and 74% of the non-team students agreed that the counselor understood them, 80% of the team and 59% of the non-team students felt comfortable talking with their counselor, and 93% of the team compared with 64% of the non-team students said their counselor tried to get them to be responsible for what they do.

No consistent differences between seventh and eighth grade students and between 1970-71 and 1971-72 seventh graders occurred.

Overall student rating of counselor helpfulness. The counselors were rated most favorably by the 1970-71 seventh graders and the 1971-72 non-team eighth graders on an overall measure of counselor helpfulness (Table 23 page 47).

Table 22

Marshall-University Seventh and Eighth Grade Students' Perceptions of Their Counselor in 1970-71 and 1971-72

	Response	1970-71 Grade 7 N=138	1971-72 Grade 7 Team N=75	1971-72 Grade 7 Non Team N=65	1971-72 Grade 8 Team N=74	1971-72 Grade 8 Non Team N=58
Understanding						
He tries to see things the way I do and to understand how I feel	SA	37%	20%	13%	14%	15%
	A	56	73	77	75	67
	D	7	8	7	7	15
	SD	0	0	4	3	4
He understands me	SA	20	14	7	3	13
	A	64	69	67	57	60
	D	13	17	23	34	17
	SD	3	0	4	6	9
Interest-Concern						
He is interested in knowing how I look at things	SA	21	14	11	7	2
	A	63	66	63	81	72
	D	11	5	19	7	20
	SD	5	4	7	4	6
He hurries me through my business with him	SA	5	0	7	1	4
	A	13	14	11	24	18
	D	56	64	58	65	66
	SD	25	22	25	10	13
I often feel that he has more important things to do when I am talking to him	SA	10	3	5	4	12
	A	26	22	25	29	28
	D	39	60	54	57	51
	SD	24	15	16	9	9
Liking						
He doesn't seem to like me very much	SA	2	3	2	2	7
	A	6	6	7	5	16
	D	52	62	67	77	54
	SD	38	28	24	17	23
I feel comfortable talking with the counselor about myself	SA	26	12	7	9	2
	A	37	68	52	33	45
	D	26	16	28	47	39
	SD	10	4	13	11	14
He is friendly toward me	SA	32	22	23	21	19
	A	56	75	70	70	68
	D	9	1	5	7	11
	SD	2	1	2	1	2
I enjoy talking with my counselor	SA	25	21	12	6	12
	A	58	56	57	58	51
	D	14	19	24	29	28
	SD	3	4	7	8	9

[a]SA-Strongly Agree, A-Agree, D=Disagree, SD= Strongly Disagree

Table 22(continued)

	Response	1970-71 Grade 7 N=138	1971-72 Grade 7 Team N=75	1971-72 Grade 7 Non Team N=65	1971-72 Grade 8 Team N=74	1971-72 Grade 8 Non Team N=58
Control-Manipulation						
He likes to tell people what to do	SA	5%	3%	2%	1%	3%
	A	18	17	20	23	22
	D	55	54	62	67	62
	SD	22	26	17	9	12
He tells his opinions more than I want to know them	SA	2	0	6	6	2
	A	18	20	19	12	21
	D	58	67	61	72	66
	SD	21	15	15	10	11
He always gives me a chance to explain my side of things	SA	38	25	26	16	26
	A	56	69	58	76	63
	D	6	4	11	6	6
	SD	1	1	4	1	6
He usually tells me what I should do rather than letting me decide for myself	SA	6	3	6	6	2
	A	22	18	24	10	9
	D	48	66	61	69	67
	SD	24	13	9	16	23
He tries to get me me to be responsible for what I do	SA	18	20	9	3	2
	A	49	73	55	88	72
	D	24	8	29	9	20
	SD	9	0	7	0	6
Congruence						
It is hard for me to know what he is like as a person	SA	8	1	15	1	7
	A	25	43	29	38	42
	D	48	40	47	51	46
	SD	19	16	9	9	5
I feel that he is honest with me; he says what he <u>really</u> thinks or feels	SA	31	20	21	14	20
	A	56	70	59	71	62
	D	11	10	16	14	16
	SD	2	0	4	1	2
Approach						
I am afraid to go to the counselor when I am in trouble in school	SA	8	4	2	3	2
	A	18	12	11	11	11
	D	45	49	59	68	65
	SD	29	35	29	18	22
I would go to the counselor on my own if I need help	SA	34	31	27	20	24
	A	53	60	61	62	59
	D	9	7	8	13	12
	SD	3	3	3	6	5
Being called to the counselor probably means I have done something wrong	SA	5	10	5	4	4
	A	15	23	28	17	18
	D	55	46	48	65	56
	SD	23	21	19	14	23

Table 23

Overall Rating of Counselor Helpfulness by Marshall-University Seventh and Eighth Grade Students in 1970-71 and 1971-72 (Percent)

	1970-71 Grade N=138	1971-72 Grade 7		1971-72 Grade 8	
		Team N=75	Non Team N=65	Team N=74	Non Team N=58
Very helpful	60%	45%	47%	42%	58%
Sometimes helpful	25	30	31	42	23
Of no help	1	0	0	3	2
I don't know	15	25	22	12	18

Team Student Reactions to the Program

The majority of the team students in seventh grade and eighth grade (64%) felt that the team concept was better for students than not having teachers and counselors work as a team (Table 24). An even greater majority said they would like to have their teachers work together as a team next year.

Table 24

Team Students' Opinions of the Team Organization

Question	Response	Seventh Team N=73	Eighth Team N=70
Do you think the team of teachers and a counselor is better for students than not having teachers and counselors work as a team?	Yes, better for students	55%	64%
	No, worse for students	12	14
	Makes no difference	14	16
	I don't know	19	6
Would you like to have your teachers work together as a team next year?	Yes	64%	72%
	No	10	15
	Makes no difference	26	13

Student preference for evaluation systems. Team students in both the seventh and eighth grades at Marshall-University preferred the usual A, B, C, D, F pupil progress report to the new evaluation report used by the team teachers. Fifty-four percent of the seventh grade team students and 64% of the eighth grade team students expressed a preference for the A, B, C, D, F report, 26% of the seventh and 29% of the eighth preferred the new system, and 19% and

24% said it made no difference.

Student evaluation of the mini-units. As mentioned earlier, the eighth grade team developed and offered two-week mini-units to the team students. Each student selected one mini-unit in each of the four subject areas. Seventy percent of the students said they received all four of their first choices.

The team students evaluated the mini-units immediately after the two-week session in February 1972. Their response was positive (Table 25 on page 49). Ninety percent of the students said they liked the mini-units and 93% said they preferred having a choice of classes such as mini-units rather than being assigned to classes.

Compared with assigned classes, 78% of the students said they liked mini-units better, and 50% said they learned more in the mini-units. A somewhat greater percentage of students said their fellow students goofed off more in the mini-units (30%) than in the assigned classes (17%).

Student Attitudes Toward School and Teachers

In May 1972 the seventh and eighth graders at Marshall University were given the Student Opinion Questionnaire, a 93-item instrument developed by the Minneapolis Schools' Research and Evaluation Department to measure student attitudes toward various aspects of school. Several factors, or groups of items that appeared to be measuring the same concept, had been identified previously.

Table 26 on page 50 gives the responses of the 1971-72 team and non-team students in both seventh and eighth grades and the responses of the 1970-71 seventh and eighth grade students to items on three factors: Liking of School, Interest in Learning, and Class Discussions. Each student marked one of four choices on each item: strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. The "Percent Agree" total in Table 26 is the percentage of students who marked either strongly agree or agree.

Both the seventh and eighth grade team students responded positively to the Liking-of-School items. For example, 78% of the seventh grade team students and 82% of the eighth grade team students said they liked school.

The responses of the 1971-72 team students were more favorable than the responses of the 1970-71 students at both seventh and eighth grade levels. As an example, 70% of the 1971-72 team students, compared with 60% of the

Table 25

Reactions of Eighth Grade Team Students to the Mini-units

Question	Response	N	%
Would you rather have a choice of classes such as the mini-units or be assigned to classes (as it was before mini-units)?	Assigned to classes	4	6%
	Choice of classes	67	93
	Makes no difference	1	1
Overall, how well did you like the mini-units?	I liked them very much	24	33%
	I liked them	41	57
	I neither liked nor disliked them	2	3
	I did not like them	5	7
Compared with assigned classes (before mini-units), how well did you like the mini-units?	I liked the mini-units better	56	78%
	I liked the assigned classes better	8	11
	No difference between assigned and mini-units	8	11
Overall, how much did you learn from the mini-units?	I learned a lot	19	27%
	I learned something	49	70
	I did not learn anything	2	3
Compared with the assigned classes, how much did you learn from the mini-units?	I learned more in the assigned classes	14	19%
	I learned more in the mini-units	36	50
	No difference between assigned and mini-units	22	31
Lokking at the entire class of students, compare the mini-units with the assigned classes.			
A. The students learned more in the	Assigned Classes	14	21%
	Mini-Units	32	49
	No Difference	20	30
B. The students enjoyed class more in the	Assigned Classes	5	7%
	Mini-Units	60	90
	No Difference	2	3
C. The students goofed off more in the	Assigned Classes	11	17%
	Mini-Units	19	30
	No Difference	34	53

Table 26

Marshall-University Seventh and Eighth Graders' Attitudes Toward School in 1970-71 and 1971-72

(Percent Agree)

Item	Seventh Grade			Eighth Grade		
	1971-72 Team N=79	1971-72 NonTeam N=60	1970-71 N=123	1971-72 Team N=77	1971-72 NonTeam N=76	1970-71 N=132
Liking of School						
School work is interesting	74%	52%	69%	81%	68%	61%
I like school	78	48	67	82	66	71
My classes are boring	44	58	35	43	38	51
I think school is fun	70	34	60	70	64	62
I don't like school work	27	59	35	43	41	41
I like my classes	68	47	72	72	66	60
Interest in Learning						
I really don"t care whether I learn anything or not	4	10	18	2	9	16
I enjoy learning new things	96	83	86	95	91	87
I would like to quit school	11	13	19	13	18	22
Class Discussions						
I enjoy being in class discussions	61	40	-	76	67	-
The lectures and class discussions by my teachers are clear and worthwhile	61	32	56	53	51	43
I don't understand my class discussions	16	30	22	17	23	24
I don't find class discussions fun or exciting	47	71	35	43	34	41

1970-71 students, said that they thought school was fun.

The 1971-72 team students also responded more positively than the 1971-72 non-team students to the Liking-of-School items. This difference was particularly evident in the seventh grade, where 78% of the team students, compared with 48% of the non-team students, said they liked school. Although the team arrangement might have been a contributing factor to the more positive attitudes expressed by the team students, there are other uncontrolled factors which might have been causally related. The team and non-team students might have been different on important variables at the beginning of the school year. Initial differences in team and non-team teacher characteristics might have been responsible for part or most of the differences in student attitudes. On the other hand, the smaller differences between eighth grade team and non-team students when compared with the seventh grade team and non-team differences might have resulted from the eighth grade non-team teachers functioning as a team during the last quarter of the school year. Or possibly the eighth grade non-team teachers were more like the eighth grade team teachers than the seventh grade non-team teachers were like the seventh grade team teachers.

Differences similar to those obtained on the Liking-of-School items occurred on the Interest-in-Learning items and the Class-Discussions items. The 1971-72 seventh and eighth grade team students expressed a greater interest in learning and a more positive attitude toward class discussion than was expressed by the 1970-71 seventh and eighth graders. Team students also had more favorable attitudes than non-team students.

Although a definite factor has not been identified statistically, several items on the Student Opinion Questionnaire are related to teachers (Table 27 on page 52). The 1971-72 seventh and eighth grade team students had favorable opinions of their teachers. The majority of the team students thought their teachers understood them (71% at seventh, 75% at eighth), liked most of their teachers (77% at seventh, 85% at eighth), and said their teachers really seemed to enjoy teaching (75% at seventh, 71% at eighth).

There were few differences between the 1971-72 seventh grade team students and the 1970-71 seventh graders, while the attitudes expressed by the 1971-72 eighth grade team students towards their teachers were more positive than attitudes expressed by the 1970-71 eighth graders.

The seventh grade team students had more favorable attitudes than the non-team students towards their teachers. A greater percentage of team seventh

Table 27

Marshall-University Seventh and Eighth Graders' Attitudes Toward Their Teachers in 1970-71 and 1971-72
(Percent Agree)

Item	Seventh Grade			Eighth Grade		
	1971-72 Team N=79	1971-72 NonTeam N=60	1970-71 N=123	1971-72 Team N=77	1971-72 NonTeam N=76	1970-71 N=132
I think my teachers understand me	71%	41%	71%	75%	70%	53%
Most of my teachers seem to like me	85	63	81	95	80	72
Most of my teachers are excellent	62	30	70	58	66	54
I find my teachers to be fun and exciting	54	32	60	64	57	48
I can get help from most teachers	87	77	82	83	82	81
I like most of my teachers	77	58	80	85	76	80
Teachers in this school do a poor job	15	35	19	17	21	21
My teachers really know how to teach	63	49	68	70	69	55
Most of my teachers are not considerate of how students feel	32	46	43	31	32	35
If students don't learn here, it is not the fault of the teachers	66	48	57	59	65	49
Teachers at this school really seem to enjoy teaching	72	50	72	71	75	60
My teachers don't treat me like a human being	9	31	14	9	16	23

graders (62%) than non-team students (30%) said their teachers were excellent, and more team (54%) than non-team (32%) students found their teachers to be fun and exciting. The differences between team and non-team eighth grade students were not consistently in favor of one group.

Student and Parent Involvement

Although the eighth grade team students had the opportunity to select mini-units and gave suggestions for future mini-units, there is no documentation of any other activities that indicates involvement and input into the school program by the 1971-72 seventh and eighth grade team students was greater than in previous years. However, the responses of the team students to the six "input" items on the Student Opinion Questionnaire were more favorable than responses of non-team students and students in the previous year (Table 28 on page 54).

As an example, 70% of the 1971-72 seventh grade team students said they helped make decisions in their classes, compared with 42% of the 1971-72 non-team seventh graders and 59% of the 1970-71 seventh graders.

Most of the parent contact with the Reorganized Junior High Program appeared to be related to individual student situations rather than involvement with the school program. One parent meeting was held in addition to the annual Open House and several parents participated during the registration for the eighth-grade mini-units.

A questionnaire was mailed to all parents of team students at the end of the year to determine the extent of their awareness and satisfaction with the team program. Questionnaire were returned by about half of the parents.

Three-fourths or more of the responding parents of team students were aware of the team's composition, were aware that their child was part of the team program, and said that their child had mentioned that his teachers were working together as a team (Table 29 page 55).

Many of the parents who returned the questionnaire had had some kind of communication with at least one member of the team (Table 30 page 55).

About half of both the seventh and eighth grade team parents had come to school for a conference about their child. Fifty-percent of the team parents also indicated that they had communicated by telephone with a team teacher and the team counselor. Ninety percent of the parents reported receiving at least one written communication from one of the team members.

Table 28

Marshall-University Seventh and Eighth Graders' Opinions About Their Input Into School Program in 1970-71 and 1971-72
(Percent Agree)

Item	Seventh Grade			Eighth Grade		
	1971-72 Team N=79	1971-72 NonTeam N=60	1970-71 N=123	1971-72 Team N=77	1971-72 NonTeam N=76	1970-71 N=132
Nobody is really interested in my opinions about how this school should be run	42%	58%	49%	42%	37%	53%
I help to make decisions in my classes	70	42	59	62	54	57
Sometimes I help decide what our class does	76	43	65	70	54	62
I am never involved in making decisions about my school or class	24	45	42	23	33	30
My teacher never asks me to help plan what our class does	29	57	-	38	49	-
Many times students are given a chance to decide what the class does	74	56	-	77	66	-

Table 29

Awareness of Marshall-University Parents of Team Students of the Team Organization

Ouestion	Response	Grade 7 N=40	Grade 8 N=36
Were you aware that the team of four teachers (English, math, science, social studies) and a counselor existed before you received this questionnaire?	Yes	85%	89%
	No	15	11
Were you aware that your son/daughter was part of the team program (that is, he/she was in classes taught by team)?	Yes	83	88
	No	18	12
Has your son/daughter mentioned that his teachers were working together as a team?	Yes	74	77
	No	26	23

Table 30

Amount of Contact Marshall-University Parents of Team Students had With Members of the Team (Seventh, N=40; Eighth, N=36)

Type of Communication	Grade	How Many Times None	Once	2-3	4 or More
Came to school for conference about my child	Seventh	55%	29%	13%	3%
	Eighth	50	41	9	0
Telephone contact with team teacher	Seventh	56	26	9	9
	Eighth	56	13	28	3
Telephone contact with counselor	Seventh	46	26	14	14
	Eighth	48	19	29	3
Written communication (letter, progress report) from team members	Seventh	11	11	39	39
	Eighth	9	6	44	41

About half of the team parents indicated a preference for the new student evaluation system, one-fourth preferred the A, B, C, D, F report card, and about 15-20% said they did not prefer one more than the other. Although it was not given as a choice on the questionnaire, several parents said they would like a combination of the two systems. On the positive side, the parents appreciated the thoroughness of the new evaluation system, while negatively, some parents would like more frequent reports, more immediate attention called to difficulties their child might be experiencing, and more attention given to letter grades.

All but a few of the parent comments on whether or not they felt the team concept was a good way to organize a junior high program were positive.

Marshall-University Summary and Recommendations

The Reorganized Junior High Program at Marshall-University centered around teacher-counselor teams that worked with half of the students in grades seven and eight. At each grade level the team consisted of a counselor and four teachers, one each from English, mathematics, science, and social studies. The counselor was seen as one of the team members with no greater assumed control in influence than any of the other team members.

Daily team meetings during the team teachers' common preparation time were the core of the project. The team used this common time to discuss individual student situations, share techniques, develop new evaluation systems, set team objectives, and discuss instructional approaches. The team also spent time on group processes to work out interpersonal problems that arose. The teachers said the counselor was a useful and necessary member of the team. Recommendation: continue the team approach with a common meeting time available daily.

More teacher-counselor contacts were reported by team teachers than by either non-team teachers or teachers from the previous year, particularly in pupil personnel service areas. Ratings of counselor effectiveness made by team teachers were also more favorable than ratings made by the non-team teachers and the 1970-71 teachers. Seventy-five percent of the team teachers said the counselors were very helpful, compared with 56% of the non-team teachers, and 27% of the 1970-71 teachers. Recommendation: counselors should continue their efforts to work more closely with teachers.

Although attempts were made to develop interdisciplinary topics and mini-units, the team teachers reported that much less team time was spent on program and curriculum development than on individual student situations. Only 4 of eight team teachers said the counselor helped plan curriculum more than once or twice during the year. Counselors were viewed as being less helpful in this area than in pupil-personnel types of contact. Recommendation: if a student-centered program is to remain as a general goal of the project, more team time should be devoted to activities related to curriculum and instruction.

The team students had favorable opinions of their counselors. About 80% of the team students said their counselor was helpful to students, while 20% did not know. The majority of the team students saw the counselor as an understanding, approachable individual who was interested in them. However, the 1970-71 seventh graders, as compared with the 1971-72 team seventh graders, said they had more contact with their counselor and rated the counselor as more helpful. Recommendation: if it was not a part of the counseling procedure last year, efforts should be made to guard against individual students being overlooked.

Although a greater percentage of team students than non-team students indicated that they helped make decisions in their classrooms, the seventh and eighth grade teams did not provide many opportunities for student or parent input into the project. Recommendation: attempts should be made to increase parent and student involvement in the development of the team program.

Perhaps the most encouraging outcome of the project was the team students' positive attitudes toward school and their teachers. Although it is not possible to separate the effects of the team organization from the effects of other uncontrolled factors, the team students did have favorable opinions of their school. About three-fourths of the team students said that they liked school, that they liked most of their teachers, and that schoolwork was interesting. A smaller percentage of non-team students shared these positive views.

ED 083289

Appendix A

New Student Evaluation Forms

SEVENTH GRADE HOUSE
Jordan Junior High School
Minneapolis, Minnesota

PUPIL ACHIEVEMENT REPORT

We have a new report card system this marking period in the seventh grade. We call it an "Achievement Report". It does not use grades or numbers to tell whether the student gets credit or not. The achievement report simply reports what skills and knowledge the student has learned this marking period.

The achievement report card is being tried in hopes that it will give the parent a better picture of what is being taught, what skills and knowledge your child has learned, and what he or she might have to learn next. There is one report sheet for each course. On each sheet, the areas to be learned and social skills to be mastered are listed for the marking period as goals. The goals or skills listed are geared to the level of development that the student is at. When the student has achieved the knowledge or behavior assigned, it is checked off with an A.

The A then means that the goal was achieved. If a goal was assigned and partial but satisfactory achievement is being made, then a mark of S is given. The L means that little or no progress was made towards the assigned goal.

The back section on behavior has been put in terms which the student and parent can clearly understand. Where the windows are left blank, it is assumed that the behavior listed was not a problem or not important in that class.

There is a space for parent, student and teacher to write, if necessary, how each views the progress made. Since teachers have over 100 students, they will write comments only if necessary. If you would like to arrange a parent-teacher conference, then put "yes" next to that question on the back.

If you have any questions at all about your child's achievement report, please do not hesitate to contact the teacher or counselor. If you wish to know how your child compares with other students on city-wide tests, contact your child's counselor at Jordan, phone 529-9631.

This achievement report for your student contains _____pages. After you have finished reading it, PLEASE SIGN THIS COVER SHEET AND RETURN ALL PAGES to Jordan as soon as possible. It will become part of your student's permanent record.

Student's Name _____

	1	2	3	4	Total
Days absent					
Times tardy					

_____ Homeroom teacher

_____ Parent's signature

3/20/72
bf

JORDAN JR . HIGH 7th GRADE

Student _____ H.R. _____ Progress report in: _____

Progress code:

A = Goal was achieved
S = Satisfactory progress was made
L = Little or no progress

Learning goals geared to the level of student development	Progress	

Learning goals geared to the level of student development	Progress	

Below is space for parent, teacher, and students to make comments regarding students progress. Comm the teachers will be made only if it is felt necessary. If a parent-teacher conference s felt necessary, then please indicate so in the appropriate space.

Teacher:

Teachers signature:

Behavior Evaluation

Volunteers help		
Accepts help		
Considerate		
Follows directions		
Participates in class		
Works independently		
Works up to ability		
Easily misled		
Profane language		
Insulting language		
Physically disrupts class		
Verbally disrupts class		
Does not bring pencil & paper		
Does not listen carefully		
Does not respect property		

Marshall-University Junior High School
Pupil Report for Team Classes Grade 7
Possible Attendance:_____Days

NAME: _____

I. Specific Objectives from each Team Teacher:

A. Social Studies (Attendance:_____days)	Seldom	Often	Almost Always
1. Grasps main ideas			
2. Sees relationships between main ideas and real-world examples			
3. Completed oral and written assignments			
4. Applies skills learned in class			
5. Participates in classroom activities			
Performance for the year:_____			

B. Mathematics (Attendance:_____days)	Seldom	Often	Almost Always
1. Shows a knowledge of basic facts			
2. Shows skill in computation			
3. Is able to apply his knowledge to a problem-solving situation			
4. Sorts, analyzes, and uses data			
5. Participates in classroom activities			
Performance for the year:_____			

C. Science (Attendance:_____days)	Seldom	Often	Almost Always
1. Grasps main ideas			
2. Completes oral and written assignments			
3. Applies skills learned in class			
4. Is able to apply his knowledge to a problem-solving situation			
5. Participates in classroom activities			
Performance for the year:_____			

D. English (Attendance:_____days)	Seldom	Often	Almost Always
1. Completes oral and written assignments			
2. Seeks to improve communication skills			
3. Becomes critical of writing techniques			
4. Is involved and willing to read and write			
5. Responds to creative challenges			
6. Participates in classroom activities			
Performance for the year:_____			

II. General Observations from all Team teachers:	Seldom	Often	Almost Always
A. Uses time and available resources			
B. Cooperates with teachers and other students			
C. Exhibits self-control			
D. Accepts individual responsibility for his/her actions			
E. Considers the feelings of others			
F. Shows respect for others' property			

Additional Comments:

Marshall-University High School

Pupil Report for Team Classes Grade 8

The report is to influence student behavior and provide positive reinforcement as well as point out areas in which he/she needs improvement. Please, in discussing this with your child, point out areas in which he is doing well as well as those areas in which he needs improvement. If you have any questions on this evaluation, please call Phil Cognetta at Piek Hall (373-4558).

NAME: _____

I. Specific Objectives from each Team teacher:

	Never	Sometimes	Usually	Always
A. English (Attendance:_____ days out of_____				
1. Completes assignments.				
2. Participates in class discussion.				
3. Shows desire to increase skills in communication.				
4. Responds positively to creative opportunities.				
5. Goes beyond classroom assignments in reading and/or writing.				
6. Works up to apparent ability.				
B. Mathematics (Attendance:_____ days out of_____	Never	Sometimes	Usually	Always
1. Can understand and apply written direction.				
2. Makes good use of class time.				
3. Works up to apparent ability.				
4. Shows a knowledge of facts (terms, symbols, processes).				
5. Applies knowledge to problem-solving situations.				
6. Has completed_____ units_____.				
7. Present grade_____.				
C. Science (Attendance:_____ days out of_____	Never	Sometimes	Usually	Always
1. Exhibits an understanding of concepts presented in class.				
2. Is able to apply the scientific method to a problem-solving situation.				
3. Displays intellectual curiosity.				
4. Completes assignments				
a. oral				
b. written				
5. Participates in classroom activities.				
6. Works up to apparent ability.				
D. Social Studies(Attendance:_____days out of_____	Never	Sometimes	Usually	Always
1. Grasps main ideas.				
2. Sees relationship between concepts and real-world events.				
3. Completes assignments.				
4. Shows curiosity and goes beyond classroom assignments.				
5. Participates in classroom activities				
6. Works up to apparent ability.				

II. General Observations from the Team:	Never	Sometimes	Usually	Always
A. Exhibits self-control.				
B. Accepts individual responsibility for his/her actions.				
C. Demonstrates poise.				
D. Shows ability to adjust to new and different situations.				
E. Can express self in clear, logical manner				
1. oral				
2. written				
F. Cooperates with teachers				
G. Is able to work well with other students.				
H. Considers the feelings of others.				
I. Shows respect for others' property.				
J. Seems to enjoy the school experience.				
K. Shows an interest in learning.				

C	Counselor	Phil Cognetta
E	English	Anne DeMuth
M	Mathematics	Herb Guertin
S	Science	Bev Cottman
SS	Social Studies	Lyle Christensen

Minneapolis Public Schools

Educational Services Division
Research and Evaluation

Harry N. Vakos, PhD., Assistant Superintendent for Educational Services

Richard W. Faunce, PhD., Assistant Director for Research and Evaluation

Lary R. Johnson, Research Associate

PUBLICATIONS -- 1971